

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-21. The Examiner has objected to claims 6, 10, 22, and 23, but states that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 1-23.

The Examiner has rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,767). Regarding claim 18, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits that Sakamoto fails to disclose the claimed invention as set forth in claim 18. As one example, Applicant submits that Sakamoto fails to disclose the step of selectively providing the output data to at least one of the first and second line cards based on routing information included in the egress data. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 18 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-17, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,767). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Regarding claims 1 and 15, as the Examiner states, Sakamoto fails to disclose a router as recited. However, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that "Sakamoto discloses that the first and second line cards comprise a router." Applicant cannot find any mention of the header conversion processing unit 41 described in the portion of Sakamoto cited by the Examiner being described as a router. Rather, the header conversion processing unit 41 of Sakamoto apparently merely performs an "ATM header conversion" and assigns "an internal cell header," but does not provide the functionality of a router as recited. Furthermore, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that "Sakamoto discloses...wherein the router provides egress data from the corresponding output to at least one of the first and second line cards based on routing information included in the egress data." Rather, the header conversion processing unit 41 appears to operate on cells being passed from interface card 1-1 to selector card 3. Thus, Applicant submits that Sakamoto teaches away from the present invention as set forth in claims 1 and 15. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 15 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 16, and 19, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1, claim 16 depends from claim 15, and claim 19 depends from claim 18. Applicant has already presented arguments for the allowability of claims 1, 15, and 18. Applicant reiterates these arguments with regard to the claims depending therefrom. Furthermore, while the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to add a buffer into the system disclosed by Sakamoto, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes that the system of Sakamoto addresses synchronization problems affecting switchover. Since buffers typically introduce some propagation delay, which would seemingly exacerbate such synchronization problems in the context of Sakamoto's system, Applicant submits that Sakamoto teaches away from the addition of buffers. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 2, 3, 16, and 19 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 4 and 17, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and claim 17 depends from claim 15. Applicant has already presented arguments for the allowability of claims 1 and 15. Applicant reiterates these arguments with regard to the claims depending therefrom. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 17 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 5 and 21, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 5 depends from claim 1, and claim 21 depends from claim 18. Applicant has already presented arguments for the allowability of claims 1 and 18. Applicant reiterates these arguments with regard to the claims depending therefrom. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 5 and 21 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 7 and 20, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 7 depends from claim 1, and claim 20 depends from claim 18. Applicant has already presented arguments for the allowability of claims 1 and 18. Applicant reiterates these arguments with regard to the claims depending therefrom. Moreover, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that Sakamoto inherently comprises filters operably coupled to an arbiter. Not only are no such filters apparently present in the system of Sakamoto, but also the portions of Sakamoto cited by the Examiner do not appear to teach any relevant filtering functionality. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 7 and 20 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 8, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 8 depends from claim 1. Applicant has already presented arguments for the allowability of claim 1. Applicant reiterates these arguments with regard to the claims depending therefrom. Moreover, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that "Sakamoto discloses that the register (27) that determines the selected data types." Not only are no filters apparently present in the system of Sakamoto, but also Applicant can find no disclosure in Sakamoto that register (27) determines selected data types as recited. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 9, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Applicant has already presented arguments for the allowability of claim 1. Applicant reiterates these arguments with regard to the claims depending therefrom. Moreover, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertions that Sakamoto inherently comprises filters operably coupled to an arbiter and active and inactive registers as recited. Not only are no such filters or active and inactive registers apparently present in the system of Sakamoto, but also the portions of Sakamoto cited by the Examiner do not appear to teach any relevant functionality. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 9 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 11, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 11 depends from claim 1. Applicant has already presented arguments for the allowability of claim 1. Applicant reiterates these arguments with regard to the claims depending therefrom. Moreover, Applicant can find no mention in Sakamoto of an NxN switch core and 2N line cards. Thus, Applicant submits that claim 11 is in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 12-14, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 12-14 depend from claim 1. Applicant has already presented arguments for the allowability of claim 1. Applicant reiterates these arguments with regard to the claims depending therefrom. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 12-14 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has objected to claims 6, 10, and 22-23 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but states that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Application No: 09/275,934

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1566.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office's rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

03/25/2003

Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.
115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 107
Austin, Texas 78745
(512) 347-9223 (phone)
(512) 347-9224 (fax)